

As Secretary Gates said last fall, “Development is a lot cheaper than sending soldiers.”

In places like Haiti and Sudan, we provide assistance not only for purely humanitarian reasons, but also because a failure to do so could lead to chaos and bloodshed that would be far more costly in the long run.

Going back to 2008 levels of global AIDS funding would mean ending antiretroviral treatment for people who are currently receiving it. It would mean abandoning pregnant women who run a high risk of transmitting HIV to their newborns. It would mean fewer orphans and vulnerable children will get care and support, and fewer people in poor countries will get HIV counseling and testing.

President Bush made clear not only the need to not cut funding, but to make greater investments in these programs when he wrote, just a few months ago, “there are millions on treatment who cannot be abandoned. And the progress in many African nations depends on the realistic hope of new patients gaining access to treatment. . . . On AIDS, to stand still is to lose ground.”

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the most obvious and damaging implications of reducing the international affairs budget to 2008 levels. This resolution would set the stage for reckless cuts that endanger our national security, abandon our national interests and throw Americans out of work, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the debate on the reduction of non-defense and security spending, a visit to recent history reveals a telling connection between our soaring debt and the two wars our country is waging.

The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation estimates that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost the average American family of four almost \$13,000 last year. We know from our constituents when we return to our districts that the average American family of four cannot afford that. They cannot afford to pay for wars that undermine our national and moral security. Many families can barely afford to stay in their homes.

Nobel Prize winning economist and author of *The Three Trillion Dollar War*, Joseph Stiglitz, says that there is “no question that the Iraq war added substantially to the federal debt. This was the first time in American history that the government cut taxes as it went to war. The result: a war completely funded by borrowing. The global financial crisis, he says, was due at least in part to the war.”

If this sounds familiar, it is because we are pursuing the same policies today. The ramifications of our spending on the Iraq War—soaring oil prices, federal debt and a global economic crisis—were during a time when the resources dedicated to Iraq were much greater than those being dedicated to Afghanistan. The commitment of an additional 30,000 troops and a continually slipping withdrawal date commits us to an endless war and an endless stream of borrowed money. It commits us to seemingly endless economic insecurity.

Moving past the costs of waging war, there are the costs of providing returning veterans with the care they need. When these costs are factored in, the costs of health care and benefits for veterans significantly increases the \$3 trillion price tag to nearly \$5 trillion.

It is time to question the way we enhance our national security and our economic secu-

urity. It will be a grave mistake to miss this opportunity.

The facts tell us that the policies we have been pursuing in recent years have led us further from the very goals we claim to be working toward. The facts tell us that it is fiscally irresponsible to continue defense spending at current rates.

By ignoring this responsibility—by pretending that it doesn’t exist—we fail to heed the lessons from our economic decline. The costs of maintaining the status quo are great. The moral and human costs are even greater.

The material previously referred to by Mr. McGOVERN is as follows:

Strike the last sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, and any amendment thereto to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules or their respective designees; (2) an amendment if offered by Representative McGovern of Massachusetts or a designee to ensure that FBI Counterterrorism funding is considered security spending, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.”

(The information contained herein was provided by Republican Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 110th and 111th Congresses.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Repub-

lican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair until 6:30 p.m., a period not longer than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MACK) at 6 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.